

REMARKS

The Office action dated June 19, 2007, and the references cited therein have been received and carefully reviewed.

As a preliminary matter, the Office action was discussed between the undersigned, the Examiner, and the Examiner's Supervisor during a personal interview on September 12, 2007, for which, the undersigned would like to thank the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor for taking the time to discuss the Office action and for their helpful comments and suggestions.

As a result of the Office action, claims 1, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nichols. Claims 1 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bergeret. Claims 4 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergeret in view of Amberg. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergeret in view of Amberg and further in view of Tecco. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergeret in view of Amberg, Tecco, and further in view of Hagen. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergeret in view of Hagen. Claims 9-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergeret in view of Tecco. And, claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergeret in view of Tecco and further in view of Hagen. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicants' invention as now claimed in any manner. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

As discussed and agreed during the personal interview, claim 1 (and similarly claim 17) has been amended to better define the dome-shaped cover to have an exterior surface and an interior surface, wherein the exterior surface faces away from the tray, the vent panel is mounted on the exterior surface, the foil is positioned between the vent opening and the panel, and the vent panel is snap locked on the dome-shaped cover, in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the Bergeret and Nichols references. None of the cited prior art references, taken individually or in combination with Bergeret and Nichols, teach the claimed invention as now claimed by claims 1 and 17. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 17 are now allowable over the prior art. Claims 4-16 and 18-19 are dependent from claims 1 and 17, respectively, and are therefore believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claims 1 and 17.

Each issue raised in the Office action dated June 19,

2007, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 1 and 4-19 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ &
MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16

Date: 11/23/07